



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,224	03/22/2001	Michael L. Boyer II	060960-5013-US	2289
28977	7590	01/27/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1701 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2921			STEWART, ALVIN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/814,224	Applicant(s) BOYER ET AL.	
	Examiner Alvin J. Stewart	Art Unit 3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25, 27, 29-32, 34-41, 43, 44, 46-52 and 54-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25, 27, 29-32, 34-41, 43, 44, 46-52 and 54-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25, 27, 29-32, 34-41, 43, 44, 46-52 and 54-59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25, 27, 29-32, and 34-41, 43, 44, 46-52 and 54-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al US Patent 6,200,347 B1 in view of Stone et al US Patent 5,624,463.

Anderson et al disclose an intervertebral disc (see Fig. 11B and col. 1, lines 10-11) comprising a cancellous body (73, see col. 17, lines 45-48) with first and second ends, a plurality of holes extending between the ends (see Fig. 11B), two cortical end caps (70) having receiving regions, and a plurality of cortical struts (7). The receiving regions are the plurality of holes (5), the bearing surface is the surface created at each hole along the thickness of each cortical cap and the end is the part created at the rim top surface of each hole cap. However, Anderson et al does not disclose a blind bore in the cortical end caps (70) for the purpose of connecting two pieces together.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cortical end caps of the Anderson et al reference with the

Art Unit: 3738

blind bore end caps of the Stone et al reference in order to connect two pieces together (see Fig. 9).

The claims disclosed above are given their broadest reasonable interpretation. In re Pearson, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA 1974).

Regarding claim 27, the struts has been entered in opening 5 by pushing the struts through the opening 5. Therefore, it has been press fitted into the opening.

Regarding claims 29 and 30, see col. 3, lines 21-23 and col. 48, lines 35-41.

Regarding claims 31 and 32, the cancellous bone is the osteoconductive material (see col. 17, lines 45-48). Natural bone promotes the growth of bone tissue.

Regarding claims 36-38, see Figs. 24, 25 and 10.

Regarding claims 39 and 41, the whole structure is capable of distributing the forces exerted to the implant. It has been held that a claim is anticipated if each element of the claim is found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, or that the claimed invention was previously known or embodied in a single prior art device or practice. Kalman vs. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 218 USPQ 789.

Anderson discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Anderson et al does not disclose a cap having a recess that does not extend completely through the end cap and a body having a cylindrical shape.

Anderson et al teaches in another embodiment (see Fig. 10) an implant comprising a cylindrical shape.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to change the rectangular shape to a circular shape

Art Unit: 3738

and discloses a recess region in the cortical cap that does not extend completely through the end cap because Applicant has not disclosed that the circular shape and the recess that does not extend completely through the end cap provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the rectangular shape and the recess that does not extend completely through the end cap because the rectangular shape will promote osteoinductivity and cellularization, provides stability, mechanical strength and the holes extending completely through the end cap will keep the implant attached together.

Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the Anderson et al to obtain the invention as specified in claims 28, 33, 45 and 52-53.

Regarding claims 41 and 54, the Examiner has not given patentable weight to the "wherein" clause because a "wherein" clause that merely states the result of the limitations in the claim adds nothing to the patentability or substance of the claim. See *Texas Instruments Inc. v. International Trade Commission*, 26 USPQ2d 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Griffin v. Bertina*, 62 USPQ2d 1431 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Amazon.com Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com Inc.*, 57 Uspq2d 1747 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 3738

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin J Stewart whose telephone number is 703-305-0277. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00AM-5:30PM(1 Friday B-week off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 703-308-2111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 18, 2006.



**ALVIN J. STEWART  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**